

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 6, 9 10, 12, 13, 18, 23, 26, 29, 34 and 35 were rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Boublik. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

As amended, Claim 1 recites parsing a plurality of electronic mail messages to identify a subset of these messages that comprise commercial correspondence. Note that electronic mail messages can be on any of a number of topics. Herein, those which concern commercial transactions are singled out through the parsing process. Once the subset of e-mails concerning commercial transactions is identified, relevant commercial data is extracted therefrom and used to create electronic receipts.

Boublik, on the other hand, concerns capturing data concerning commercial Internet transactions made by a user operating a browser. A commercial transaction is identified by the user's access of an e-commerce website. The transmissions between the e-commerce website and the browser are then parsed for data of interest.

Nothing in Boublik discloses or suggests examining e-mail messages at all, much less parsing a plurality of electronic mail messages to identify a subset thereof that comprise commercial correspondence, or extracting relevant commercial data from this identified subset as recited by Claim 1.

Claim 2 depends from Claim 1 and should thus be allowable for at least the same reasons. Claim 6 is a method claim reciting limitations that correspond to those of system claim 1, and should thus be allowable for at least the same reasons. Claims 9 and 10 depend from claim 6 and should thus be allowable for at least the same reasons as Claim 6.

As amended, claim 12 recites parsing electronic mail messages and extracting data therefrom, which, as explained above, is not disclosed or suggested by Boublik. Furthermore, claim 12 recites extracting data in accordance with user configurable preferences contained in data records in a database. Nothing in

Boublik discusses or implies extracting data in accordance with user configurable preferences (contained in data records in a database or otherwise). The database in Boublik is used to store parsed data so that it can be accessed by a user at a later time.

Claims 13, 18 and 34 depend from claim 12 and should thus be allowable for at least the same reasons. Claim 23 (and dependent claims 26, 29 and 35) are method claims reciting limitations that correspond to those of system claim 12 and its dependents, and should thus be allowable for at least the same reasons.


Claims 3-5, 7, 8, 14-17, 24, 25 and 28 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious in light of a hypothetical combination of Boublik and Julien. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

First of all, each of these claims depends from an independent claim which is distinct from Boublik as discussed above, and thus should be allowable for that reason alone. Furthermore, the Examiner relies on Julien for the limitations of alteration and updating of header data. As amended, the claims at issue recite "header data of electronic mail messages." Julien concerns processing Uniform Resource Locators pointing to web pages, not e-mail messages, and therefore could not disclose updating or amending headers of electronic mail messages, as the pending claims recite. For the record, Applicant traverses any assertion that Julien discloses updating or altering any type of header, as well as the Examiner's statement that there exists any motivation to combine Boublik and Julien.

Claim 27 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious in light of a hypothetical combination of Boublik and Kramer. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. Claim 27 depends on Claim 23, which is distinct from Boublik as discussed above. Therefore, Claim 23 should be allowable over a hypothetical combination of Boublik and Kramer for at least this reason. For the record, Applicant traverses the Examiner's statement that there exists any motivation to combine Boublik and Kramer.

In view of the above, this application is deemed to be in allowable condition. The Examiner is therefore earnestly requested to withdraw all outstanding rejections, allow the application to pass to issue as a United States Patent. Should the Examiner have any questions regarding the application, she is invited to please contact Applicant's attorney at (650) 474-8400.

Respectfully submitted,



Jeffrey Brill

Reg. No. 51,198

Customer No. 22,862